

NOV 4 1943

CREPLEY

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1943

No. 220

WALTER FORD GORMLY, Petitioner-Appellant, vs.

UNITED STATES, Respondent-Appellee.

Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit

MOTION FOR REHEARING AND BRIEF THEREON

PERRY J. STEARNS, 927 Wells Building, Milwaukee 2, Wisconsin Attorney for Petitioner-Appellant.

INDEX

Tiv Dia	Page No.
Argument	5-36
Brief on Motion for Rehearing	3-36
Conclusion	34-36
Invocation	4
Petition for Rehearing	1-3
SYNOPSIS OF ARGUMENT	
I. Petitioner's case as important as cases in w writs recently granted	
a. Falbo Case The defense that the order of the Draft Board is not authorized by the Act is just as absolute as the defense that a Minister of the Gospel is exempt. As the Court is to consider one absolute defense it should also consider the other arising under the same law.	t
The question whether Mr. Billings was subject to military law under a War Department regulation to effect that registrant is inducted before oath is given, is equalled, if not exceeded in national importance, by the question of whether a civilian who has been assigned by his draft board to work of national importance need accept the assignment, there being no express provision in the Act on that point.	
II. Brief in opposition considered	

22.24

25-34

- Matters quoted support the facts attempted to be proved by petitioner, but which the trial court excluded (exception taken), to the effect that Civilian Public Service Camps are not under civilian direction. The order assigning petitioner to such camp, therefore, did not comply with the conditions prescribed by Congress and petitioner need not obey the order.
- IV. Argument of Arthur J. Edwards adopted

 The gentleman from Montclair convincingly shows that the C. P. S. camps subject the assignees to involuntary servitude, and so an assignment to such unconstitutional confinement need not be obeyed. Such imprisonment cannot be made the condition of exemption from military service under the pronouncements of this court. The Director exceeded his powers under the Act in imposing such a condition, and the order of the Draft Board is invalid and not a legal foundation for the indictment.

INDEX OF CASES

Arver vs. U. S., 245 U. S. 366
Billings vs. Truesdell, 135 F. (2) 5052, 5, 8, 9, 10, 22
Bowles case, 318-319 U. S
Butler vs. Perry, 240 U. S. 328
Cox vs. Wood, 247 U. S. 3
Falbo vs. U. S. A., 135 F. (2) 4642, 5, 7, 8, 9, 22
Flannagan vs. Jepson, 177 Iowa 393 26
Frost vs. Railroad Comm., 271 U. S. 583 30
Goldman vs. U. S., 245 U. S. 474
Hamilton vs. Regents, 293 U. S. 245
Minersville School Dist. vs. Gobitis, 310 U. S. 58632, 35
Parsons vs. Bedford, 28 U. S. (3 Pet.) 433 19
Ruthenberg vs. U. S., 245 U. S. 480

	Page No.
State ex rel. Burnes Nat. Bank vs. Duncan,	
265 U. S. 17	33
Taylor vs. Georgia, 62 S. C. 45	32
U. S. vs. Chi. M. St. P. & P. R. Co., 282 U. S. 311	17, 19, 20
U. S. vs. Gormly	25, 31, 34
U. S. vs. Grieme, 128 F. (2) 811	8
U. S. vs. MacIntosh, 283 U. S. 605	21, 22, 32
U. S. vs. Mroz, 136 F. (2) 221	21, 31, 34
U. S. vs. Williams, 302 U. S. 46	21
W Va State Rd of Educ vs Barnette.	
63 S. C. 1178	32, 35
TEXTS AND STATUTES	
	10 00 00
Act, Sec. 5 (g)	16, 26, 29
91 A. L. R. 795 at 803	20
Const., Am. V	
Const., Am. XIII	
12 C. J. 937-8	
Black, "Interpretation of Laws"	19
American Civil Liberties Union, Bull. 1099	22, 23
Conscience and the War, a report of Amer. Civ.	
Lib. Union	
Conscientions Objectors and National Service Acts	
Conscientious Objector under Act of 1940	
Cooley, Constitutional Limitations	
Memo on National Service Acts 1939-41	
8 U. S. C. A. 56	
18 U. S. C. A. 444	
50 U. S. C. A., App. Sec. 11, 311	10